REMARKS

After the foregoing amendment, claims 1 – 8 and 10 – 17 are pending. Applicant submits that the amendment does not introduce new matter into the application.

Examiner Interview

On May 20, 2009, Applicant's undersigned representative and the Examiner discussed the March 25, 2009 Action and proposed amendments. In particular, the Examiner agreed that the amendment "such that when said user receives a mail item in said user's inbox operation of <u>a single</u> one <u>of</u> said button<u>s automatically</u> enables <u>all</u> <u>of the following to be performed</u>... ." would overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection based on Microsoft Outlook 2003. This proposed amendment is included in the claim listing, above.

The Examiner discussed issues regarding statutory subject matter. Applicant believes that claims 1 – 8 are not directed to methods and are statutory subject matter. Claims 1 – 5 are directed to a COMM Addin and claims 6 – 8 are directed to a system.

Nonetheless, Applicant's representative pointed out that the subject matter of claims 1 – 8 addresses transformation of a computer screen, as follows. Claim 1, as amended, recites: *"adding a plurality of menu buttons* to at least one personal organizational software page viewable *on a user's screen."* Italics added. Claim 5, as amended recites: *"addition of a plurality of menu buttons* to at least one page displayed by operation of said personal organizational software and viewable *on a user's screen."*

Italics added. Applicant believes that this transformation of the user's screen is sufficient to satisfy the machine or transformation test even if the test were applicable.

In response to the interview, Applicant also adds claims 10 – 17, which recite a computer readable medium and a system containing a computer readable medium. Applicant believes that these claims are also statutory subject matter.

Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Action rejects claims 1 – 9 over Microsoft Outlook 2003. Outlook's limited features, however, are precisely the prior art that the claimed invention sought to overcome. Take an example from Outlook: If a user wants to reply to an email message and delete the message, he must first select the reply button, and then when he is done composing his reply, select the delete button to delete the message from his inbox. This requires 2 selections. And that is just that one example; other tasks in Outlook require multiple button or menu selections; the claimed invention consolidates those button/menu selections into single selections.

For example, claim1 recites: "such that when said user receives a mail item in said user's inbox operation of a single one of said <u>buttons automatically</u> enables all of the following to be performed: (i) said user to reply to the mail item, forward the mail item, or create a new item entry; (ii) said mail item is respectively copied to said reply, forwarded mail item or new item entry; and (iii) said mail item is removed from said inbox.

Claim 1's recitation is a one-step solution to a multi-step problem in Outlook. Many of the dependent claims recite further steps that can be folded into a single claimed step and thus Outlook fails to anticipate or render obvious claims 1-4. Claim 5's recitation is also a one-step solution to the multi-step problem in Outlook, which also fails to anticipate or render obvious claims 5 – 8.

Claim 9 is cancelled and its rejection is moot.

New claims 10 – 17 recite a computer readable medium and a system containing a computer readable medium. The computer readable medium contains instructions to accomplish the one-step solution.

Applicant respectfully believes that the rejection is overcome and requests withdrawal of the same.

CONCLUSION

The pending claims should all now be allowable. If the examiner believes that an interview would advance the prosecution of this case, he is invited to call the undersigned at his convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen Daryl Barnes

By /Douglas J. Bucklin/
   Douglas J. Bucklin
   Registration No. 51,208
   (215) 568-6400

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.
United Plaza, Suite 1600
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103

DJB/dmp